

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 15 2006

RemarksAmendments to the Claims

The claims have been amended, as indicated above. The amendments to the indicated claims has been presented in accordance with the proposed revisions to 37 C.F.R. §1.121 as set forth in 1267 OG 106 (25 February 2003). No new matter has been introduced through the amending of the claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 19-23 are objected to for various informalities. The claims have been amended, as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1-17, 20, and 22-24 have been canceled. With respect to claims 18, 19, and 21, the Applicant contends that the specification provides sufficient support for the phrase "creating a slippage between the sheet and the auxiliary roller nip." As clearly set forth in the specification in paragraphs 12-16, as the sheet of media is being fed by the auxiliary roller nip in one of the directions of Arrows Y, the leading edge of the sheet of media contacts back stop 14 (Figure 1). Once the leading edge of the sheet of media contacts back stop 14, the sheet of media no longer easily slides along lower guide plate 12. This causes a resistance (slippage) in the sheet of media to any further movement along the direction of Arrow A.

Once this happens, rotation slippage device 13 is activated. In this manner, drive roller shaft 11 still rotates along the direction of Arrow Z, but auxiliary drive roller 10 does not rotate. Even though auxiliary drive roller 10 does not rotate at this point in time, the sheet of media is still retained within the auxiliary roller nip. After the activation of rotation slippage device 13 has been observed, such as through a conventional optical feedback device 20, the Idler roller 19 of media output nip 16 is rotated along a one of the directions of Arrows X so that it contacts media output nip drive roller 17. Once this occurs, the sheet of media is fed along lower guide plate 12 in the direction of Arrow B by the rotation of auxiliary drive roller 10 in the other direction of Arrows Y. The leading edge of the sheet of media then

contacts the media output nip 16. The sheet of media is fed to print engine 4 so that an image can be placed upon the second side of the sheet of media.

After the sheet of media is fed to print engine 4, the idler roller of media output nip 16 is rotated along the other direction of Arrows X so that it no longer contacts media output nip drive roller 17. Once this is been accomplished, the process can be repeated to duplex further sheets of media. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12, 14, 15, 17-20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by Lambert et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1-17, 20, and 22-24 have been canceled. With respect to claims 18, 19, and 21, Claim 23 has been added to Claim 18, as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 8 and 16 have been canceled. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1-6, 9-14, 17-20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh in view of Grandjean or Lambert et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1-17, 20, and 22-24 have been canceled. With respect to claims 18 and 19, Claim 23 has been added to Claim 18, as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh in view of Grandjean or Lambert et. and further in view of Kodama. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With respect to Claim 21, Claim 23 has been added to Claim 18, as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.


The Applicant gratefully acknowledges that Claim 23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections/rejections. With respect to Claim 21, Claim 23 has been added to Claim 18, as suggested by the Examiner.

SEP 15 2006

The art of record cited by the Examiner but not applied in the Office Action has been considered. However, the Applicant contends that this unapplied prior art does not anticipate and/or render obvious the claimed subject matter of the present invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for allowance and now may be passed to issue forth with. A holding to this effect is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney during normal Pacific Time Zone business hours.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Craig Hopper*

  
James R. McDaniel  
Reg. No. 34,481  
858.655.4157

Date: 9/15/06

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400